

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

RONALD SATISH EMRIT, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,

Defendant.

Case No. 2:14-cv-01760-GMN-PAL

**ORDER**

(Mtn in Limine – Dkt. #26)  
(Mtns to Redact – Dkt. ##27, 32)  
(Mtn for Nolle Prosequi – Dkt. #28)  
(Mtn to Request Civil Jury Trial – Dkt. #29)  
(Mtn for Appointment of Counsel – Dkt. #30)

This matter is before the Court on six motions filed by *pro se* Plaintiffs Ronald Satish Emrit and Nicole Rocio Leal-Mendez: Motion in Limine (Dkt. #26), Motion to Redact the FRCP Rule 59 Motion to Request a New Trial (Dkt. #27), Motion for Nolle Prosequi (Dkt. #28), Motion to Request a Civil Jury Trial (Dkt. #29), Motion for Appointment of Counsel (Dkt. #30), and Motion to Redact the Motion to Vacate the Dismissal Order (Dkt. #32).<sup>1</sup> The Court has considered these motions. This matter was referred to the undersigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A) and LR IB 1-3 and 1-9.

On April 22, 2015, Court entered an Order to Show Cause (Dkt. #21) directing Plaintiffs to file a response on or before May 22, 2015, stating why they should not be barred from filing any further actions in this court without first obtaining permission. This was based on Plaintiffs' long history of vexatious litigation in the District of Nevada and other federal district courts and circuit courts of appeal around the country. That same day, the Court entered an Order (Dkt. #20) denying Plaintiffs' Motion to Reopen Case (Dkt. #18), Motion to Vacate Order Dismissing Case (Dkt. #19), and Motion in Limine (Dkt. #17) as procedurally improper, frivolous, and

<sup>1</sup> The Court will address Plaintiffs' Motion for Voluntary Dismissal (Dkt. #24) in the Report of Findings and Recommendation entered concurrently with this Order.

1 premature. The Court also screened the Complaint (Dkt. #1-1) and determined that Plaintiffs  
2 failed to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. *See* Order (Dkt. #20).

3 Since the Court issued the Order to Show Cause addressing Plaintiffs' patent abuse of the  
4 legal system, Plaintiffs have filed seven additional motions. The six motions addressed by this  
5 Order are procedurally improper, nonsensical and frivolous, individually and when read together.  
6 For example, the Plaintiffs request a jury trial, a trial date and appointment of counsel at the  
7 same time they seek to abandon the prosecution of this action and a motion in limine admitting  
8 an attached document as character evidence. These inappropriate filings reinforce the conclusion  
9 that filing restrictions are necessary to curb Plaintiffs' abusive litigation conduct. As the Order  
10 to Show Cause explained in great detail, Plaintiffs have a long history of submitting meritless  
11 and frivolous filings. The motions are denied.

12 Based upon the foregoing,

13 **IT IS ORDERED:**

- 14 1. Plaintiffs' Motion in Limine (Dkt. #26) is DENIED.
- 15 2. Plaintiffs' Motion to Redact the FRCP Rule 59 Motion to Request a New Trial  
16 (Dkt. #27) is DENIED.
- 17 3. Plaintiffs' Motion for Nolle Prosequi (Dkt. #28) is DENIED.
- 18 4. Plaintiffs' Motion to Request a Civil Jury Trial (Dkt. #29) is DENIED.
- 19 5. Plaintiffs' Motion for Appointment of Counsel (Dkt. #30) is DENIED.
- 20 6. Plaintiffs' Motion to Redact Motion to Vacate (Dkt. #32) is DENIED.

21 Dated this 15th day of June, 2015.

22   
23 PEGGY A. LEEN  
24 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
25  
26  
27  
28